

OBSERVABLE CONCENTRATION OF MM-SPACES INTO SPACES WITH DOUBLING MEASURES

KEI FUNANO

ABSTRACT. The property of measure concentration is that an arbitrary 1-Lipschitz function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on an mm-space X is almost close to a constant function. In this paper, we prove that if such a concentration phenomenon arise, then any 1-Lipschitz map f from X to a space Y with a doubling measure also concentrates to a constant map. As a corollary, we get any 1-Lipschitz map to a Riemannian manifold with a lower Ricci curvature bounds also concentrates to a constant map.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let μ_n be the volume measure on the n -dimensional unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^n$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ normalized as $\mu_n(\mathbb{S}^n) = 1$. In 1919, P. Lévy proved that for any 1-Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{S}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, the inequality

$$\mu_n(\{x \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid |f(x) - m_f| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq 2 e^{-(n-1)\varepsilon^2/2}$$

holds, where m_f is some constant determined by f . For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This means that any 1-Lipschitz function on $\mathbb{S}^n$ is almost closed to a constant function for sufficient large n . In 1999, M. Gromov introduced the notion of the observable diameter in [3]. Let us recall its definition.

Definition 1.1. Let Y be a metric space and ν_Y a Borel measure on Y such that $m := \nu_Y(Y) < +\infty$. We define for any $\kappa > 0$

$$\text{diam}(\nu_Y, m - \kappa) := \inf\{\text{diam } Y_0 \mid Y_0 \subseteq Y \text{ is a Borel subset such that } \nu_Y(Y_0) \geq m - \kappa\}$$

and call it the *partial diameter* of ν_Y .

An *mm-space* is a triple (X, d, μ) , where d is a complete separable metric on a set X and μ a Borel measure on (X, d) with $\mu(X) < +\infty$.

Definition 1.2 (Observable diameter). Let (X, d, μ) be an mm-space and Y a metric space. For any $\kappa > 0$ we define the *observable diameter* of X by

$$\text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} Y, m - \kappa) := \sup\{\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa) \mid f : X \rightarrow Y \text{ is an 1-Lipschitz map}\},$$

where $f_*(\mu)$ stands for the push-forward measure of μ by f .

Date: February 2, 2008.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 28E99, 53C23.

Key words and phrases. doubling measure, mm-space, observable diameter, separation distance.

The target metric space Y is called the *screen*. The idea of the observable diameter came from the quantum and statistical mechanics, that is, we think of μ as a state on a configuration space X and f is interpreted as an observable. Suppose that $\text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}, m - \kappa) < \varepsilon$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon, \kappa > 0$. By the definition, for any 1-Lipschitz function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there exists a Borel subset $A_f \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{diam } A_f < \varepsilon$ and $f_*(\mu)(A_f) \geq m - \kappa$. If we pick a point $m_f \in A_f$ and fix it, then we have

$$\mu(\{x \in X \mid |f(x) - m_f| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq \mu(f^{-1}(\mathbb{R} \setminus A_f)) \leq \kappa.$$

Since ε and κ are sufficiently small positive numbers, the above inequality means that any 1-Lipschitz function f on X is almost close to the constant function m_f . On the basis of this fact, we define a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces is a *Lévy family* if $\text{diam}(X_n \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}, m_n - \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\kappa > 0$, where m_n is the total measure of the mm-space X_n . Gromov proved in [3] that if a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces is a Lévy family, then $\text{diam}(X_n \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}^k, m_n - \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\kappa > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. He also discussed the case that the dimension of $\mathbb{R}^k$ goes to ∞ . Our paper [2] tackles this problems in the case that the screens are the real hyperbolic spaces. Gromov treated in [3] the case that the screen Y moves around all elements of a family $\mathcal{C}_0$ of compact metric spaces which is precompact with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff distance. In particular, he proves the following theorem. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\kappa_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $D > 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{m, \kappa_1, D}$ the set of all complete Riemannian manifolds M of dimension m such that $\text{Ric}_M \geq \kappa_1$ and $\text{diam } M \leq D$.

Theorem 1.3 (Gromov [3]). *Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Lévy family. Then we have*

$$\sup\{\text{diam}(X_n \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} M, m_n - \kappa) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_{m, \kappa_1, D}\} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\kappa > 0$.

In this paper, we consider more large class of screens. We treat the case that screen Y has a doubling measure. Let Y be a metric space. Given $x \in Y$ and $r > 0$, we indicate by $B_Y(x, r)$ the closed ball centered at x with radius r . For a number $R > 0$ and a function $C : (0, R] \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$, we denote by $D_{C, R}$ the set of all pairs (Y, ν_Y) satisfying the following properties: ν_Y is a Borel measure on Y such that

$$0 < \nu_Y(B_Y(x, r)) < +\infty$$

and

$$(1.1) \quad \nu_Y(B_Y(x, 2r)) \leq C(r)\nu_Y(B_Y(x, r))$$

for all $x \in Y$ and $r > 0$ with $r \leq R$. A main theorem of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Lévy family and $C : (0, R] \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$ an arbitrary function. Then we have*

$$\sup\{\text{diam}(X_n \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} Y, m_n - \kappa) \mid (Y, \nu_Y) \in D_{C, R}\} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\kappa > 0$.

Theorem 1.4 together with Bishop-Gromov volume comparison theorem proves that Theorem 1.3 holds even without the diameter bound D for the screens.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Basics of doubling measures. Although the following lemma and corollary are somewhat standard, we prove them for the completeness of this paper.

Lemma 2.1 (cf. [1]). *Suppose that $(Y, \nu_Y) \in D_{C,R}$. Then for any $r_1, r_2 > 0$ with $2r_1 \leq 2r_2 \leq R$, there exists a number $C(r_1, r_2)$ depending only on r_1 and r_2 such that*

$$\frac{\nu_Y(B_Y(x, r_1))}{\nu_Y(B_Y(y, r_2))} \geq \frac{1}{C(r_1, r_2)^2} \left(\frac{r_1}{r_2}\right)^{C(r_1, r_2)}$$

for any $x, y \in Y$ with $x \in B_Y(y, r_2)$.

Proof. Put $j := \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid B_Y(y, r_2) \subseteq B_Y(x, 2^i r_1)\}$ and $\tilde{C}(r_1, r_2) := \max\{C(2^i r_1) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \log_2(2r_2/r_1)\}$. Since $B_Y(y, r_2) \not\subseteq B_Y(x, 2^{j-1} r_1)$ and $B_Y(y, r_2) \subseteq B_Y(x, 2r_2)$, we have $2^{j-1} r_1 \leq 2r_2$. Iterating (1.1) j times yields

$$\nu_Y(B_Y(y, r_2)) \leq \nu_Y(B_Y(x, 2^j r_1)) \leq \tilde{C}(r_1, r_2)^j \nu_Y(B_Y(x, r_1)).$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\frac{\nu_Y(B_Y(x, r_1))}{\nu_Y(B_Y(y, r_2))} \geq \tilde{C}(r_1, r_2)^{-j} \geq \tilde{C}(r_1, r_2)^{-\log_2 \frac{4r_2}{r_1}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{C}(r_1, r_2)^2} \left(\frac{r_1}{r_2}\right)^{\frac{\tilde{C}(r_1, r_2)}{\log 2}}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose that $(Y, \nu_Y) \in D_{C,R}$ for some $R > 0$ and $C : (0, R] \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$. Then $B_Y(x, r)$ is compact for any $x \in Y$ and $r > 0$ with $2r \leq R$.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that $B_Y(x, r)$ is not compact. Then, there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\varepsilon \leq \min\{R - r, r\}$ and infinite 3ε -separated set $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq B_Y(x, r)$. By using Lemma 2.1, we have

$$+\infty > \nu_Y(B_Y(x, R)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \nu_Y(B_Y(x_i, \varepsilon)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \frac{1}{C(\varepsilon, r)^2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{r}\right)^{C(\varepsilon, r)} \nu_Y(B_Y(x, r)) = +\infty,$$

which implies a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

2.2. Separation and concentration. In this subsection, we prove several results in [3] because we find no proof anywhere.

Let (X, d) be a metric space. For $x \in X, r > 0$, and $A, B \subseteq X$, we put

$$d(A, B) := \inf\{d(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}, \quad d(x, A) := d(\{x\}, A), \quad A_r := \{x \in X \mid d(x, A) \leq r\}.$$

Definition 2.3. Let (X, d, μ) be an mm-space. For any $\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_N \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sep}(X; \kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_N) &= \text{Sep}(\mu; \kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_N) \\ &:= \sup \left\{ \min_{i \neq j} d(X_i, X_j) \mid X_0, \dots, X_N \text{ are Borel subsets of } X \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{such that } \mu(X_i) \geq \kappa_i \text{ for any } i \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and call it the *separation distance* of X .

The proof of the following lemma is easy and we omit the proof.

Lemma 2.4 (cf. [3]). *Let (X, d_X, μ_X) and (Y, d_Y, μ_Y) be two mm-spaces. Suppose that an 1-Lipschitz map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies $f_*(\mu_X) = \mu_Y$. Then we have*

$$\text{Sep}(Y; \kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_N) \leq \text{Sep}(X; \kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_N).$$

Lemma 2.5 (cf. [3]). *Let (X, d, μ) be an mm-space and $\kappa, \kappa' > 0$ with $\kappa > \kappa'$. Then we have*

$$\text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}, m - \kappa') \geq \text{Sep}(X; \kappa, \kappa').$$

Proof. Let $X_1, X_2 \subseteq X$ be two closed subsets such that $\mu(X_1), \mu(X_2) \geq \kappa$. We define a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(x) := d(x, X_1)$. Let us show $\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa') \geq d(X_1, X_2)$ by contradiction. Suppose $\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa') < d(X_1, X_2)$. There exists a closed subset $X_0 \subseteq [0, +\infty)$ such that $\text{diam } X_0 < d(X_1, X_2)$ and $\mu(f^{-1}(X_0)) \geq m - \kappa'$. If $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$, we have a contradiction since

$$\mu(f^{-1}(X_0) \cup X_1) = \mu(f^{-1}(X_0)) + \mu(X_1) \geq (m - \kappa') + \kappa > m.$$

In the same way we have $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. Take a point $x_1 \in f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_1$. $f(x_1) = d(x_1, X_1) = 0 \in X_0$ implies that $X_0 \subseteq [0, \text{diam } X_0]$. Therefore, we have $f^{-1}(X_0) \subseteq (X_1)_{\text{diam } X_0}$, which yields $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_2 = \emptyset$ since $\text{diam } X_0 < d(X_1, X_2)$. This is a contradiction since $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. As a consequence, we obtain $\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa') \geq d(X_1, X_2)$ and this completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Remark 2.6. In [3], Lemma 2.5 is stated as $\kappa = \kappa'$, but that is not true in general. For example, let $X := \{x_1, x_2\}$, $d(x_1, x_2) := 1$, and $\mu(\{x_1\}) = \mu(\{x_2\}) := 1/2$. Putting $\kappa = \kappa' = 1/2$, we have $\text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}, 1/2) = 0$ and $\text{Sep}(X; 1/2, 1/2) = 1$.

We denote by $\text{Supp } \mu$ the support of a Borel measure μ .

Lemma 2.7 (cf. [3]). *Suppose that $\text{Supp } \mu$ is connected. Then, for any $\kappa > 0$ we have*

$$\text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}, m - \kappa) \geq \text{Sep}(X; \kappa, \kappa).$$

Proof. Let $X_1, X_2 \subseteq X$ be two closed subsets such that $\mu(X_1) \geq \kappa$ and $\mu(X_2) \geq \kappa$. Define a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(x) := d(x, X_1)$. We will show $\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa) \geq d(X_1, X_2)$ by contradiction. Supposing that $\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa) < d(X_1, X_2)$, there exists a closed

subset $X_0 \subseteq [0, +\infty)$ such that $\text{diam } X_0 < d(X_1, X_2)$ and $\mu(f^{-1}(X_0)) \geq m - \kappa$. If $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$, we have

$$\mu(f^{-1}(X_0) \cup X_1) = \mu(f^{-1}(X_0)) + \mu(X_1) \geq (m - \kappa) + \kappa = m,$$

which implies $\text{Supp } \mu \subseteq f^{-1}(X_0) \cup X_1$. This is a contradiction since $\text{Supp } \mu$ is connected. In the same way, we have $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. Picking $x_1 \in f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_1$, we get $f(x_1) = d(x_1, X_1) = 0 \in X_0$, which yields $X_0 \subseteq [0, \text{diam } X_0]$. Hence, we have $f^{-1}(X_0) \subseteq (X_1)_{\text{diam } X_0}$, which implies $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_2 = \emptyset$ since $(X_1)_{\text{diam } X_0} \cap X_2 = \emptyset$. This is a contradiction because $f^{-1}(X_0) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. As a result, we obtain $\text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - \kappa) \geq d(X_1, X_2)$, which completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 2.8 (cf. [3]). *Let ν be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with $m := \nu(\mathbb{R}) < +\infty$. Then, for any $\kappa > 0$ we have*

$$\text{diam}(\nu, m - 2\kappa) \leq \text{Sep}(\nu; \kappa, \kappa).$$

Proof. Put $a_0 := \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} \mid \nu((-\infty, a)) \leq \kappa\}$ and $b_0 := \inf\{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid \nu((b, +\infty)) \leq \kappa\}$. Then, we have $a_0 \leq b_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \nu((-\infty, a_0 + \varepsilon)) = \nu((-\infty, a_0]), \\ \kappa &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \nu((b_0 - \varepsilon, +\infty)) = \nu([b_0, +\infty)). \end{aligned}$$

$\nu((-\infty, a_0)) \leq \kappa$ and $\nu((b_0, +\infty)) \leq \kappa$ imply $\nu([a_0, b_0]) \geq m - 2\kappa$. Therefore, indicating by $d_{\mathbb{R}}$ the usual Euclidean distance, we obtain

$$\text{diam}(\nu, m - 2\kappa) \leq \text{diam}([a_0, b_0]) = b_0 - a_0 = d_{\mathbb{R}}((-\infty, a_0], [b_0, +\infty)) \leq \text{Sep}(\nu; \kappa, \kappa).$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2.9 (cf. [3]). *For any $\kappa > 0$, we have*

$$\text{Sep}(X; \kappa, \kappa) \geq \text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{R}, m - 2\kappa).$$

Proof. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary 1-Lipschitz function. From Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.8, we have $\text{Sep}(X; \kappa, \kappa) \geq \text{Sep}(f_*(\mu); \kappa, \kappa) \geq \text{diam}(f_*(\mu), m - 2\kappa)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Combining Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 2.9 we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.10 (cf. [3]). *A sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces is a Lévy family if and only if $\text{Sep}(X_n; \kappa, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\kappa > 0$.*

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $\{(Y_n, \nu_{Y_n})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be any sequence of $D_{C,R}$ and $\{f_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ any sequence of 1-Lipschitz maps. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $32\varepsilon \leq 3R$, it suffices to show that $\text{diam}(f_{n*}(\mu_n), m_n - \kappa) \leq 6\varepsilon$ for any n by choosing a subsequence. The claim obviously

holds in the case of $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n = 0$, so we assume that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n > 0$. Take a maximal ε -separated set $\{\xi_\alpha^n\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \subseteq Y_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Claim 3.1. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n$, we have*

$$\text{Card}(\{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 5\varepsilon)\}) \leq 2^{4C(\varepsilon/3, 16\varepsilon/3)} C\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \frac{16\varepsilon}{3}\right)^2.$$

Proof. By Cororally 2.2, the set $\{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 5\varepsilon)\}$ is finite. Let $\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\} := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 5\varepsilon)\}$ and take $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $\nu_{Y_n}(B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\beta_j}^n, \varepsilon/3)) = \min\{\nu_{Y_n}(B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\beta_\ell}^n, \varepsilon/3)) \mid \ell = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Since

$$\nu_{Y_n}\left(B_{Y_n}\left(\xi_\alpha^n, \frac{16\varepsilon}{3}\right)\right) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^k \nu_{Y_n}\left(B_{Y_n}\left(\xi_{\beta_\ell}^n, \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right)\right) \geq k \nu_{Y_n}\left(B_{Y_n}\left(\xi_{\beta_j}^n, \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right)\right),$$

combining this and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$k \leq \frac{\nu_{Y_n}(B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 16\varepsilon/3))}{\nu_{Y_n}(B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\beta_j}^n, \varepsilon/3))} \leq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon/3}{\varepsilon/3}\right)^{C(\varepsilon/3, 16\varepsilon/3)} C\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \frac{16\varepsilon}{3}\right)^2 = 2^{4C(\varepsilon/3, 16\varepsilon/3)} C\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \frac{16\varepsilon}{3}\right)^2.$$

This completes the proof of Claim 3.1. $\square$

By Claim 3.1, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\alpha_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$ such that

$$k_n := \text{Card}(\{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\alpha_n}^n, 5\varepsilon)\}) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \text{Card}(\{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 5\varepsilon)\}).$$

By taking a subsequence, we get $k_n \equiv k$ for any n . Put $\{\beta_1^n, \beta_2^n, \dots, \beta_k^n\} := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\alpha_n}^n, 5\varepsilon)\}$. We take $J_1^n \subseteq \{\xi_\alpha^n\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n}$ which is maximal with respect to the properties that J_1^n is 5ε -separated and $\xi_{\beta_1^n}^n \in J_1^n, \xi_{\beta_2^n}^n \notin J_1^n, \dots, \xi_{\beta_k^n}^n \notin J_1^n$. Next, we take $J_2^n \subseteq \{\xi_\alpha^n\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \setminus J_1^n$ which is maximal with respect to the properties that J_2^n is 5ε -separated and $\xi_{\beta_2^n}^n \in J_2^n, \xi_{\beta_1^n}^n \notin J_2^n, \dots, \xi_{\beta_k^n}^n \notin J_2^n$. In the same way, we pick $J_3^n \subseteq \{\xi_\alpha^n\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \setminus (J_1^n \cup J_2^n), \dots, J_k^n \subseteq \{\xi_\alpha^n\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \setminus (J_1^n \cup J_2^n \cup \dots \cup J_{k-1}^n)$. Then we have

Claim 3.2. $\{\xi_\alpha^n\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} = J_1^n \cup J_2^n \cup \dots \cup J_k^n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Let us suppose that $\xi_\alpha^n \notin J_1^n \cup J_2^n \cup \dots \cup J_k^n$. Since J_i^n is maximal for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, there exists $\xi_{\gamma_i}^n \in J_i^n$ such that $d_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, \xi_{\gamma_i}^n) < 5\varepsilon$ and $\xi_\alpha^n \neq \xi_{\gamma_i}^n$. Therefore, we have

$$k+1 \leq \text{Card}(\{\xi_\alpha^n, \xi_{\gamma_1}^n, \xi_{\gamma_2}^n, \dots, \xi_{\gamma_k}^n\}) \leq \text{Card}(\{\beta \in \mathcal{A}_n \mid \xi_\beta^n \in B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 5\varepsilon)\}) \leq k,$$

which is a contradiction. $\square$

By Claim 3.2, we have $Y_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_i^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, \varepsilon)$. Therefore, by taking a subsequence, there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 \leq j_0 \leq k$ and

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n)\left(\bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, \varepsilon)\right) \geq \frac{m_n}{k}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we obtain

Claim 3.3.

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n) \left(Y_n \setminus \bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. If $f_{n*}(\mu_n) \left(Y_n \setminus \bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) \geq C'$ for a constant $C' > 0$ and infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d_{Y_n} \left(Y_n \setminus \bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon), \bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, \varepsilon) \right) \leq \text{Sep} \left(f_{n*}(\mu_n); C', \frac{1}{k} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n \right) \\ &\leq \text{Sep} \left(\mu_n; C', \frac{1}{k} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, since the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We have the claim. $\square$

Claim 3.4. For any sufficient large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\xi_{\gamma_n}^n \in J_{j_0}^n$ such that

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n) \left(B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\gamma_n}^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) \geq \frac{1}{6} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n.$$

Proof. Let us prove the claim by contradiction. Suppose that

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n) \left(B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) < \frac{1}{6} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n$$

for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n$. By Claim 3.3, there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n) \left(\bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J_{j_0}^n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) \geq \frac{5}{6} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n.$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq n_0$. From the assumption, if $n \geq n_0$ we have $J'_n \subseteq J_n$ such that

$$\frac{1}{6} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n \leq f_{n*}(\mu_n) \left(\bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J'_n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) \leq \frac{1}{3} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n.$$

Hence, by putting $J''_n := J_n \setminus J'_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d_{Y_n} \left(\bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J''_n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon), \bigcup_{\xi_\alpha^n \in J'_n} B_{Y_n}(\xi_\alpha^n, 2\varepsilon) \right) \leq \text{Sep} \left(f_{n*}(\mu_n); \frac{1}{6} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n, \frac{1}{2} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n \right) \\ &\leq \text{Sep} \left(\mu_n; \frac{1}{6} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n, \frac{1}{2} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

Claim 3.5. *We have*

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n)(Y_n \setminus B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\gamma_n}^n, 3\varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. The claim immediately follows from the same proof of Claim 3.3. $\square$

By Claim 3.5, for any sufficient large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$f_{n*}(\mu_n)(Y_n \setminus B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\gamma_n}^n, 3\varepsilon)) \leq \kappa,$$

which implies $\text{diam}(f_{n*}(\mu_n), m_n - \kappa) \leq \text{diam } B_{Y_n}(\xi_{\gamma_n}^n, 3\varepsilon) \leq 6\varepsilon$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. $\square$

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Professor Takashi Shioya for valuable discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio and P. Tilli, *Topics on analysis in metric spaces*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 25. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- [2] K. Funano, *Observable concentration of mm-spaces with hyperbolic spaces as screens*, preprint, 2007.
- [3] M. Gromov, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Based on the 1981 French original, With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes. Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates. Progress in Mathematics, 152. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [4] M. Ledoux, *The concentration of measure phenomenon*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 89. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, SENDAI 980-8578, JAPAN

E-mail address: sa4m23@math.tohoku.ac.jp